

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/687,447 | BENCO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Meless N. Zewdu | 2683 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Meless N. Zewdu.

(3) _____.

(2) John R. Garrett (Reg. No. 27,888).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 January 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Previous rejection.

Claims discussed:

Claims 6-7 and 12-13

Prior art documents discussed:

Previous rejection

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner explained to applicant that amended claims 6 and 12 are structured improperly and do not overcome the previous rejection. Claim 6, as an instance, was discussed. In claim 6, the claim configuration calls a mobile subscriber to perform at least one of the functions provided therein. But, most of the function provided are performed by the network, not by the mobile subscriber (see claim 6, lines 6-12). Following the discussion, applicant agreed with examiner. The agreement resulted in the cancellation of claims 6-7 and 12-13. The rest of the live claims were found allowable.